

**Council on Technology Services
Privacy, Security & Access Workgroup
August 19, 1999**

Participants: Cheryl Clark (DMV), Jim Adams DIT, Andy Poarch (DIT, Bob Baird (DIT), Dan Ziomek (DTP), Dan Galloway (SCC), Mike O'Neil (DSS), Captain Lewis Vass (VSP), Ed Morris (DOC), Dan Houlihan (VIPnet), Patricia Jackson (VT), Peggy Maupin (DGS), Brandon Weidner (Computer Associates), Gerry Anderson (EntrustTechnologies), Fred Norman (Unisys Corporation), Dennis Reynolds (Entrust Technologies).

Cheryl Clark welcomed everyone and invited introductions.

DEMO OF COLD FUSION SOFTWARE

Cheryl Clark noted that Jim Adams has arranged for Bob Baird to demo the Cold Fusion software in response to the suggestion that this could be a tool to economize on use of members time to draft and review document contents.

At the conclusion of the demo, Peggy raised a question as to whether the OAG could confirm that use of the software did not violate requirements for public meetings.

Andy will confirm.

Several members asked questions of Bob Baird to clarify the mechanics and administration of the comment process.

At request of the Chair, Jim Adams agreed to serve as administrator for PSA and to work out details for usage.

Cheryl Clark announced that arrangements have been made to provide some staff assistance to the Workgroup for technical writing and research. The individual was unable to meet with the group today, but will be introduced at the next meeting.

PSA WEB SITE CONSTRUCTION

Dan Galloway gave an assessment of status on completions of contents and members gave any updated status.:

Dan is willing to try to support administration and coordination It was agreed that staff who have constructed the input in this first round would be designated as custodians for the content in those areas?

Target for first opening remains mid-September.

DGIF DIGITAL SIGNATURE INITIATIVE

Cheryl advised that Virgil Kopf had reported that DGIF has held discussion with both APA and DOA.

He indicates that DOA would accept the forms and electronic signature if the APA would verify the electronic signatures solution meets the five criteria of the statute. Their hope is to have everything in place by October 1 so that can happen. Cheryl will ask Ray Davis if he will continue to report on this topic to the Workgroup in the hope that agreements DGIF reaches with DOA and APA could serve as a template for other agencies.

ENTRUST BRIEFING

Gerry Anderson and Dennis Reynolds with Entrust made a PowerPoint presentation on history and future of digital signature legislation, Virginia's current legislation and on e-Commerce from a Governor's and legislator's perspective.

Cheryl noted that the state of Washington has issued an RFP for PKI/DSign and distributed an excerpt which summarized the scope and approach.

PSA REPORT TO COTS ON DIGITAL SIGNATURES

Cheryl reviewed the background and approach to date for developing the report. She stated that the group needs to arrive at a clear focus, scope and purpose for the report and opened the floor to discussion.

A lengthy discussion ensued. Following represent a summary of key points:

- o Dan H. noted the importance of developing an initial outline and adhering to it as development of content proceeds. He noted the importance of follow-on education for the Council to enable them to address the report which will be presented to them. Dan stated his opinion that the overall purpose should be to figure out what the most important issues are and what actions COTS needs to take in relation to DSigns in order to make e-commerce flourish in the Commonwealth.

- o Andy endorsed Dan's summary of purpose and emphasized the importance of education not just to COTS but also to key members of the General Assembly, if legislation will be put forth.

- o Ed noted that the report should contain a clear summary of background that will give the readers a perspective for what follows. He endorsed the outline of contents which had been presented by Cheryl at the prior meeting.

o Dan Z. noted that Secretary Upson has asked for two things: standards and a plan. He questioned whether any efforts are going on via DIT, DTP or VIPnet paralleling what the Workgroup has undertaken.

Dan H. conveyed his understanding that no parallel efforts will go on in the short term.

o A discussion followed concerning how standards would be issued. Consensus was the Workgroup would recommend standards which would be presented to the Secretary and COTS for adoption. Once adopted, these would be incorporated into enterprise architecture as part of the security layer and enforced by DTP.

o Dan Z. noted that the Workgroup will need to articulate the business case; that is, what are the functions of government that require digital signatures and which mandate that we have DSign standards.

o Mike questioned whether the Workgroup's immediate purpose is to lay out a solution or lay out a strategy. Dan H. responded that he thinks the answer is somewhere in between. We are at a point where standards, for example, can be very specific. On the other hand, legislation may be necessary to address such things as making a better distinction between digital and electronic signatures. In the middle would be such things as policies and procedures for how digital signatures would be accepted and processed between agencies. Dan H. summarized that some aspects of the report can be very specific, some mid-range and some very global or strategic.

o Pat noted that the Workgroup might need to recommend legislation, particularly in relation to the digital v. electronic signature question. In addition, the Workgroup should anticipate that some other stakeholders might also introduce legislation which the Workgroup should be in a position to respond to.

o Capt. Vass opened a discussion about the scope and purpose of the PSA Workgroup and to what degree overall privacy, authentication and access issues need to be addressed at this juncture for incorporation in the report. It was noted and acknowledged that the Commonwealth is already using a variety of forms of electronic signatures and has been for many years. Capt. Vass described the goal of providing a single means of authentication for those who are entitled to access information throughout the Commonwealth, regardless of whether that information resides and noted the need for integration of information. He indicated this could take two or more years to address. Mike indicated that all of these issues are part of the Workgroup's concern but that we need to deal with a limited first set of issues and within the time frame allotted. This would take the form of open principles and standards. Capt. Vass stated that a first step might simply be for COTS to issue guidelines which keep the agencies in unison on this technology.

o A question arose as to whether there is any agency or entity which has been designated with the authority to issue such standards. It was confirmed that the Sec. of Technology has this authority by statute.

o Dan H. clarified that the Workgroup is focusing at this time on standards and security features for those transactions which require a legally binding signature. Ed agreed with this focus. He noted that the report should provide individual and central agencies with a framework for moving forward in concert and recognized that use of this technology may require agencies to reengineer their business processes.

o Cheryl summarized that while the Workgroup's overall charter is to address privacy, security and access issues in the broadest sense, the immediate purpose is to provide a roadmap of what steps the Commonwealth needs to take next in order to deploy digital signatures. All PSA issues are important, but at this time, they have a place only as context to the issues pertaining directly to digital signatures.

Andy concurred.

o Capt. Vass and Dan H. recommended that we accept the topical list and report content outline presented at the 8/3 meeting and use them concurrently to develop content.

o Gerry agreed to draft topics #1-21 (what the technology is and how it works). Dan H. will draft topic #21 Directory Services. Cheryl will ask staff support to draft topics #3, 24, and 26 (Why? Scope and Business Case).

o Ed reminded the group of the importance of having input and advice from the APA and volunteered to recruit APA participation. Peggy stated her opinion that the central agencies, though somewhat skeptical, are willing to cooperate and support, but are waiting for guidance or understanding on how to proceed.

Ed noted that the Workgroup should not neglect the issue of interoperability across jurisdictional lines.

o Gerry asked for clarification as to whether Cold Fusion would be open to comment from the industry partners and this was affirmed. Pat Jackson asked if she could recruit others in the educational community who could comment via Cold Fusion. The group felt that this would be very beneficial.

NEXT PSA MEETING

Tuesday, September 7th from 1-3 pm in rm. 702 at DMV HQ in Richmond